

COVER SHEET

Title: Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project (TRTP)

Subject: Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (SEIR/SEIS)

Lead Agencies: California Public Utilities Commission and U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service.

Abstract: The TRTP was approved by the CPUC and a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity was granted December 24, 2009 (Decision 09-12-044); the Forest Service approved the TRTP in a Record of Decision issued October 4, 2010. Since that time, Southern California Edison (SCE) has constructed portions of the Approved Project and completed final engineering on other portions of the TRTP. In accordance with Mitigation Measure L-2b (*Aircraft flight path and safety provisions and consultations*), SCE has consulted with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regarding the new transmission structures to be installed as part of the Approved Project. On October 17, 2011, SCE filed a Petition for Modification of Decision 09-12-044 to modify the TRTP in response to the recommendations of the FAA. Modifications include installation of marker balls on certain transmission line spans; installation of lights on certain transmission structures; and engineering refinements in Segment 8 between Chino and Mira Loma Substations to lower certain structures, which would require changing the previously approved tower type for seven (7) structures. (Note: The CPUC has issued a construction stay for Segment 8A within the City of Chino Hills [Decision 11-11-020, as modified by Decision 12-03-050], which per the July 12, 2012 ruling of the Assigned Commissioner will continue until the CPUC makes a final determination on undergrounding options; Segment 8A undergrounding options are not the subject of the SEIR/SEIS.)

This SEIR/SEIS for the TRTP has been prepared to inform the public of changes to the Approved Project and the associated environmental impacts resulting from these changes, as well as to meet the needs of the State and federal agencies that will issue permits or other approvals for the Project, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Per State CEQA Guidelines §15163(b), the supplement to an EIR need contain only the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised. As such, this SEIR/SEIS is focused to include a discussion only of the components and issue area impacts related to the proposed changes to the Approved Project recommended by the FAA. NEPA similarly states that “there shall be only brief discussion of other than significant issues,” and “there should be only enough discussion to show why more study is not warranted” (40 CFR 1502.2(b)). The issue areas discussed in detail in the SEIR/SEIS include: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Noise, Visual Resources, and Traffic and Transportation.

Contact Information: John Boccio, CEQA Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission
Phone: (415) 703-2641

Lorraine Gerchas, NEPA Project Manager
USDA Forest Service
Phone: (626) 574-5281

Mail Comments To:
John Boccio/Lorraine Gerchas
CPUC/USDA Forest Service
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
5020 Chesebro Road, Suite 200
Agoura Hills, CA 91301
OR
Email: trtpsuppeir-eis@aspeneg.com

Comments: Comments on the Draft SEIR/SEIS must be submitted to the address and/or email provided above. It is important that reviewers provide their comments at such times and in such a way that they are useful to the Agency’s preparation of the Final SEIR/SEIS. Therefore, comments should be provided prior to the close of the comment period and should clearly articulate the reviewer’s concerns and contentions. The submission of timely and specific comments can affect a reviewer’s ability to participate in subsequent administrative review or judicial review. Comments received in response to this solicitation, including names and addresses of those who comment, will become part of the public record for this proposed action. Comments submitted anonymously will be accepted and considered; however, anonymous comments will not provide the respondent with standing to participate in subsequent administrative review or judicial review.